

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

MICHEAL JEFFERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARGARET GILBERT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:19-CV-5121-RJB-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
COURT ORDER

Plaintiff Micheal Jefferson, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See* Dkt. 7. On June 15, 2020, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Order to Allow that only Plaintiff has Sole Access to his Mail/with no Further Interference from William Lane and Counsel.” Dkt. 62. In the Motion, Plaintiff complains about the process for receiving his legal mail at Stafford Creek Corrections Center (“SCCC”). *Id.* He also complains about non-party William Lane’s conduct toward Plaintiff regarding Plaintiff’s legal mail. *Id.* Plaintiff requests the Court enter an order directing all documents to be provided directly to Plaintiff and that Plaintiff be required to sign for all legal mail deliveries. *Id.*

1 The Supreme Court has “recognized that experienced prison administrators, and not  
2 judges, are in the best position to supervise the daily operations of prisons across this country.”  
3 *Johnson v. California*, 543 U.S. 499, 529 (2005). Here, Plaintiff is requesting the Court involve  
4 itself in the daily operations of SCCC and its decisions regarding the delivery of mail and  
5 documents. *See* Dkt. 62. The Court has reviewed the Motion and declines to insert itself into the  
6 daily operations of SCCC. *See Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners’ Labor Union, Inc.*, 433 U.S.  
7 119, 125 (1977) (courts must give “appropriate deference to the decisions of prison  
8 administrators”). Therefore, the Court declines to enter an order directing all documents to be  
9 provided directly to Plaintiff and that Plaintiff be required to sign for all legal mail deliveries.

10 The Court further notes Mr. Lane is not a party to this lawsuit and the complaints raised  
11 in the Motion are unrelated to the claims raised in the Amended Complaint. *See* Dkt. 17. If  
12 Plaintiff wishes to pursue claims against Mr. Lane or related to his access to his legal documents,  
13 he must file a separate § 1983 case.

14 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion (Dkt. 62) is denied.

15 Dated this 13th day of August, 2020.

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_

18 David W. Christel  
19 United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24